

REMARKS

The application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed on August 8, 2006. Claims 1-18 are currently pending in the application, with Claims 1, 7 and 14 being in independent form. It is respectfully submitted that the claims pending in the application, namely Claims 1-18 are fully supported by the specification, introduce no new subject matter, and are patentable over the prior art.

The specification was objected to by the Examiner due to a few informalities. By this amendment document the specification has been amended in a manner believed to overcome the objection. In particular, Paragraphs [0042], [0043] and [0044] were amended to change “26th aspect” to “25th aspect”; “27th aspect” to “26th aspect”; and “28th aspect” to “27th aspect,” respectively. It is respectfully submitted that the amendments to the specification do not constitute new matter. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-6 and 14-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by Kagawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,910,118) in view of Gooch (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0174710). Claims 7-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gooch in view of Kagawa et al. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection with respect to these claims.

Claims -1-6

Independent Claim 1 describes a fixed length data search device including, *inter alia*, “a pointer table memory for storing a memory pointer table having a memory address at which each fixed length datum is stored with said hash value as an index”.

It is respectfully submitted that neither Kagawa et al., Gooch or the combination thereof disclose or suggest the “pointer table memory” recited in Claim 1. As stated in the Office Action, Kagawa et al. does not disclose a “pointer table memory for store a memory pointer” as recited in Claim 1. With respect to Gooch, the Office Action states that Gooch teaches a pointer table memory for storing a memory pointer table, as recited in Claim 1. The Office Action points to Paragraph [0040] of Gooch as support for this assertion. However, careful reading of Paragraph [0040] indicates that Gooch uses a hashing pointer. For example, Paragraph [0040] of Gooch recites that “Each hashing pointer references a block of memory containing one or multiple IP entries (e.g., addresses).” Nowhere does Gooch suggest or suggest using a pointer table memory as described by Applicant’s claims. Accordingly, Claim 1 is believed to be patentable over Kagawa et al., Gooch or the combination thereof. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-6 depend directly or indirectly from independent Claim 1 and are therefore patentable for at least the reason that independent Claim 1 is patentable, as discussed hereinabove. It is respectfully requested that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Claim 14-18

Independent Claim 14 describes a method of searching fixed length data including, *inter alia*, the steps of “referring to a memory pointer table holding a memory address at which each fixed length datum is stored with said hash value as an index”.

As discussed hereinabove with respect to Claim 1, Kagawa et al., Gooch, and the combination thereof fail to disclose or suggest the “memory pointer table” recited in Applicant’s claims. Accordingly, Claim 14 is believed to be patentable over Kagawa et al., Gooch or the combination thereof. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claim 14 be withdrawn.

Claims 13-18 depend directly or indirectly from independent Claim 14 and are therefore patentable for at least the reason that independent Claim 14 is patentable, as discussed hereinabove. It is respectfully requested that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Claims 7-13

Claims 7 and 13 also described a “pointer table memory,” which, as described hereinabove with respect to Claims 1 and 14, is not disclosed or suggested in the combination of Gooch and Kagawa et al. Accordingly, Claims 7-13 are believed to be patentable over Kagawa et al., Gooch and the combination thereof. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims now pending in this application, namely Claims 1-18 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early and favorable consideration of this application is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone or personal interview may facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, she is respectfully requested to contact Applicants undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

No fee is believed to be due for the submission of this amendment. If any fees are required, however, the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 09-0458.

Respectfully Submitted,

/Rosa Suazo/
Rosa Suazo
Reg. No. 56,753
Attorney for Applicants
Phone: (845) 892-9701

International Business Machines Corporation
D/18G, B/321, Zip 482
2070 Route 52
Hopewell Junction, NY 12533
Phone: (845) 892-9701
Fax: (845) 892-6363